UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,075	09/27/2001	Richard G. Hartmann	END920010023US1	3378

7590	08/03/2005	EXAMINER

IBM Corporation
Intellectual Property Law (Dept. 917, Bldg. 006-1)
3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, DUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/965,075	HARTMANN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 May 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 1-12, 14, 15, 18-22, 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

        A.   The following terms lack antecedent basis:

I.	said application	-	claims 1, 4, 19, 20, 21
II.	said client	-	claim 3.
III.	said client workstation	-	claims 4, 5
IV.	said client	-	claims 6, 8, 11
V.	said display	-	claim 7
VI.	said character	-	claims 9, 10, 18, 22
VII.	said buffer	-	claims 14, 24, 25
VIII.	said keystroke	-	claims 26, 27
VI.	said workstation	-	claims 26, 27
V.	said server application	-	claims 26, 27

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-7, 9-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Beardsley et al. [US Patent No 5,361,344], in view of Angelo et al. [US Patent No 5,748,888].

6.   As per claim 1, Beardsley discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a

method for character interactive input/output in a half duplex block mode environment

including a workstation and a server, comprising the steps of:

automatically transferring said keystroke from said workstation over a ½ duplex block

mode interface to a full duplex character interactive (I/O) server application [i.e. block mode

terminal [18, Figure 1] interfaces with character mode server [11a, Figure 1] through a block

mode-character mode converter program [11b, Figure 1]] [Figure 1; Abstract; col 2, lines 62-

65; and col 4, lines 20-33];

said application processing said keystroke and responding appropriate to context of said

server application [i.e. identifying control characters] [col 2, lines 26-54; and col 12, lines 25-

47].

Beardsley does not specifically disclose

receiving a key stroke into a buffer at said workstation.

Angelo discloses

receiving a key stroke into a buffer at said workstation [112, Figure 1; and col 12, lines

19-23].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to combine the teaching of Beardsley and Angelo because Angelo's teaching of buffering

keystroke would allow to control and manipulate input information.

7.   As per claim 2, Angelo discloses said buffer being an auto enter, non-display entity

on a display screen [i.e. character "X" or "*" could be echoed] [col 8, lines 31-33].

8.   As per claim 3, Angelo discloses said buffer being a non-screen entity accessible to

said client [col 9, lines 41-47].

9.   As per claim 4, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 2.

Furthermore, Angelo discloses defining a workstation display as a 1-byte character input field [

i.e. a byte or 8-bits] [col 9, lines 47-54]. It would have been obvious to combine the teaching

of Beardsley and Angelo because the teaching of Angelo would provide a standard for device to

communicate with each other without errors.

10.   As per claim 5, Beardsley discloses communicating an attention signal from said client

workstation; responsive to said attention signal, communicating said keystroke from said

workstation display to said server application [col 1, lines 22-37; and col 9, lines 58-col 10,

lines 12].

11.   As per claim 6, Beardsley discloses client and server together becoming a cascaded client

to a targeted application server that requires character dependent input/output in full duplex

mode [Figures 1; Abstract and col 3, lines 33-54].

12.   As per claim 7, Angelo discloses the step preventing display of said input character on

said display [i.e. echo character "X" or "*"] [col 8, lines 31-33].

13.   As per claims 9 and 10, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4

and 5.

14.   As per claim 11, Beardsley discloses returning from said remote application to said client

a display character for display at said workstation display [col 1, lines 22-38].

15.   As per claim 12, Beardsley discloses an echo character which may be said input character

[col 5, lines 45-47; and col 6, lines 26-28].

16.   As per claim 13, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 4 and 5.

17.   As per claim 14, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 4.

18.   As per claim 15, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 12.

19.   As per claims 16-25, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1-12.

20.   As per claim 26, Beardsley discloses transferring said keystroke from said workstation to a telnet client [i.e. VT100, VT220] [col 1, lines 20-22] and thence to said server application via a Unix server [11a, Figure 1].

21.   As per claim 27, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 26.

22.   Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beardsley et al. [US Patent No 5,361,344], in view of Angelo et al. [US Patent No 5,748,888], and further in view of Shoquist et al. [US Patent No 5,361,199].

23.   As per claim 8, Beardsley and Angelo do not specifically disclose the step of operating said client and providing for translation of said character from EBCDIC to ASCII. Shoquist discloses the step of operating said client and providing for translation of said character from EBCDIC to ASCII [col 11, lines 13-20]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Beardsley, Angelo and

Shoquist because Shoquist's teaching of character translation would provide device from

multiple platforms to efficiently communication with each other without any errors.

24.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

25.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months

and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for

response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P

710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The

examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached at (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100